

## **REMARKS**

Claim 43 is canceled. Claims 73-81 are added. Claims 42, 44-47, and 73-81 are in the application for consideration.

The specification is amended to correct errors of a typographical nature.

Independent claim 42 stands rejected as being obvious over a combination of U.S. Patent No. 6,034,409 to Sakai et al. and U.S. Patent No. 5,536,674 to Bohr. Independent claim 42 has been amended to recite that the first sidewall comprises a segment which is substantially straight linear, and that the first sidewall is not substantially straight linear along an entirety of its length. Support for the same is inherent from Applicant's application as-filed, for example from original claim 43 and in Applicant's application at p.8, Ins.6-15. The subject matter of added claims 73 and 76 is also supported at p.8, Ins.6-15. Accordingly, no new matter is added. Applicant's claim 42, as amended, requires that the first sidewall have some substantially straight linear segment, as well as having some portion which is not substantially straight linear. Therefore, by definition, such includes a substantially straight portion as that phrase is defined in Applicant's specification and a curved portion which is not substantially straight as-defined.

Each of the cited Sakai et al. and Bohr patents is understood to only disclose a first sidewall having only a substantially straight linear segment along an entirety of its length, and accordingly, neither reference has or teaches that which Applicant now recites in its independent claim 42. As each reference is lacking in this regard, a combination of the references does not suggest what

Applicant recites in its amended claim 42. Accordingly, such claims should be allowed, and action to that end is requested.

Independent claim 75 has been added, and should be allowable for the reasons argued above with respect to the allowability of claim 42. Therefore, allowance of claim 75 is respectfully requested.

Applicant's dependent claims should be allowed as depending from allowable base claims, and for their own recited features which are neither shown nor suggested in the cited art. For example, with respect to Applicant's dependent claims 73 and 76, such positively recite that the second sidewall comprises a segment which is substantially straight linear, with the second sidewall also not being substantially linear along an entirety of its length. Neither of the cited references, in the context of Applicant's claims, is understood to disclose such. Accordingly, the combination of such references does not suggest that which Applicant recites in dependent claims 73 and 76. Indeed, neither of the references, whether taken alone or in combination, could suggest a combination of Applicant's first and second stated intersecting sidewalls wherein each includes a straight and a non-straight portion as-defined. Accordingly, dependent claims 73 and 76 should be allowed, and action to that end is requested.

An earnest attempt has been made to place this application into immediate condition for allowance, and action to that end is requested

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 12-14-04

By: 

Mark S. Matkin  
Reg. No. 32,268